

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 are currently pending in the present application. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,631,122 B1 (Arunachalam).

It is gratefully acknowledged that Claims 11-18 have been allowed and that Claims 5-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base Claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base Claims and any intervening Claims.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1, Claim 1 has been amended and is further distinguished.

The present invention, as recited in Claim 1, is directed to a communication system which can provide interactive call services such as a group call and an interactive call to one or more users. These call types are shown in Table 1 (see, page 13 of the present Application) and described in corresponding parts of the present application. For example, a Service Class defines a type of call service such as a Group Call Types 1 and 2 and Private Call Types 1 and 2. Each of these call types has a predefined channel (e.g., a predefined F-CCCH/BCCH, ect. as shown in Table 1) which is used by all members of

the corresponding class. The Group Call Type 1 is defined by the present application as an interactive call service within a predefined user group, while a Group Call Type 2 is defined by the present application as a multicast call service within a predefined user group. This concept is neither taught nor suggested by Arunachalam. Moreover, Table 1 illustrates a Quality of Service (QoS) for each class. Arunachalam merely discloses a wireless quality of service (QoS) agent for an all-Internet Protocol (IP) network in which the QoS agent couples to an all-IP network.

In contrast to that which is taught by Arunachalam, Claim 1, as amended, includes the recitation of constructing a set of service primitive information including radio physical channel assignment information and information on a type of call service and a corresponding quality of service (QoS) in accordance with at least one service class for the packet call service, which is neither taught nor suggested by Arunachalam. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 1, 11, and 17-18 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-10, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on amended Claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-10

is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-18, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", is written over the typed name.

Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant

**DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP**  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-8484  
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/VAG/ml